R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 522 UD 004 359

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1966--ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 89-10.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE DEPT. OF PUB. INSTR., BISMARK

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.12 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- FEDERAL PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, PROGRAM COORDINATION, OBJECTIVES, SELF CONCEPT, STUDENT ATTITUDES, TABLES (DATA), INNOVATION, PERSONNEL, ESEA TITLE I, NORTH DAKOTA

THIS 1966 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT TITLE I PROGRAMS IN NORTH DAKOTA IS BASED ON DATA FROM 218 OF THE 240 SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH FUNDED PROJECTS. NOTE IS MADE THAT THE EVALUATION WAS HANDICAPPED BY INSUFFICIENT TIME AND THE LACK OF CERTAIN DATA. THE REPORT FOLLOWS THE FORMAT OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES FOR STATE EVALUATIONS AND DISCUSSES THE OPERATION AND SERVICES, DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, EVALUATION EFFORTS, AND PROBLEM AREAS. THE MAJOR DIFFICULTY FOR THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT WAS THE TIMING OF THE FUNDING WHICH "MADE TITLE I ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO ADMINISTER." THERE WERE MISCONCEPTIONS ON THE LOCAL LEVEL ABOUT SCOPE OF THE PROJECT, COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROJECTS (E.G., COMMUNITY ACTION PROJECTS), EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, AND DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY. THERE WERE ALSO WIDESPREAD DIFFICULTIES IN FINDING QUALIFIED PERSONNEL FOR TITLE I PROJECTS, IN GETTING APPROPRIATE MATERIALS, AND WITH OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS. SOME DATA ARE REPORTED ON THE CHILDREN'S SELF-CONCEPTS AND ENTHUSIASISM FOR SCHOOL, WHICH ARE CONSIDERED THE MOST IMPORTANT OBJECTIVES FOR NORTH DAKOTA PROGRAMS. IT IS FELT THAT TITLE I PROGRAMS WERE "EXTREMELY SUCCESSFUL" IN ENHANCING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY, PROVIDING ENRICHMENT, RAISING ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, AND IMPROVING ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL, ALTHOUGH LITTLE DATA ARE PRESENTED IN SUPPORT OF THESE FEELINGS. THE MOST EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS WERE THOSE STRESSING BASIC SKILL DEVELOPMENT, MUSIC, PHYSICAL FITNESS, LIBRARY USE, AND GUIDANCE. SOME TABULAR DATA ARE INCLUDED. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED014522

04359

F6 09536 ESEA

Department of Public Instruction

Bismarck, North Dakota

State of North Dakota

Annual Evaluation Report

for

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1966

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

TITLE I

Public Law 89-10

Submitted to the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education

Washington, D. C. 20202

UD004359

The evaluation contained herein is based upon data received from 218 out of 240 school districts which operated projects and which reported on 405 out of 446 projects. This report, then, is based upon a 91% return.

It was expected that evaluation of Title I programs would add to our knowledge of effective ways to educate disadvantaged children. School districts were encouraged to try new approaches as well as to expand current practices. Therefore, it was not anticipated that all projects would be extremely successful nor that all programs would show significant gains in the short time. The expectations were well founded in most instances, but promising results were achieved in a number of projects. With the continuation of Title I the disadvantaged child will receive the assistance necessary to realize his full potentialities and become a contributing citizen.

Evaluation efforts were hindered by the late start. A full-time coordinator for Title I was employed in February and evaluation personnel joined the staff in June. Therefore, the enclosed evaluation is without some information which would have contributed to a more complete picture of the effectiveness of this Title.

The organization of this report adheres to the May, 1966 Guidelines furnished by the United States Office of Education as a guide for State evaluations.

Part 1

1. Operation and Services:

The State Department of Public Instruction has provided the local school districts with many services relating to Title 1, especially after the department was strengthened with a full-time coordinator for this Title. The Mid-Winter Conference of School Administrators, as well as The Fall Administrators' Workshop, gave considerable attention to Title 1. Some site visitations were carried out but were limited by the necessity of devoting time to more pressing matters. This service will be greatly expanded during the 1966-67 project year in order to give local directors the needed guidance.

Six institutes for reading instructors were held during the summer of 1966 providing help for 360 participants. The success of the institutes was so great that plans are now being made to continue the program in 1967. Eight regional workshops concerned with the financial accounting and record keeping for Title 1 projects were held in the fall of 1966. The lack of such knowledge and skill on the part of the small school administrator necessitated the workshops.

Abstracts of all approved projects for the 1965-66 school year were periodically circulated to all schools in the state, not just schools participating in Title 1. Forms and materials furnished by the United States Office of Education have been distributed to all schools as they were received by the State Department of Public Instruction. Consultant services were and are available on an individual basis from the Title 1 coordinator, as well as the other specialists in the State Department; such as the Math and Science Coordinators, Director of Guidance,

Elementary and Secondary Education Directors, Title II Coordinator, ect. These people provided help in planning and implementing projects. Data processing services were not available in 1965-66 but will commence in 1967 and be expanded in the years following. Assistance in evaluation was available from the two evaluation officers who utilized the personnel and facilities available at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota, and who also provided assistance to the local schools upon request.

Summary of services offered by State Department:

1. School Administrators' Mid-Winter Conference
2. Fall Administrators' Workshop
3. Site visitations
4. Reading institutes
5. Regional fiscal accounting workshops
6. Project abstracts circulated
7. Distribution of U. S. Office of Education materials
8. Individual counseling by all State Department personnel
9. Evaluation assistance

2. Dissemination:

(a) 1. Since money was made available so late in the year, little time was devoted to dissemination on the local level. The local districts had difficulty planning and implementing projects without having time to concern themselves with providing information to other schools. The projects have not been in operation long enough to provide information worth disseminating. However, many of the administrators circulated information through informal discussions, especially at the meetings of various county-wide schoolmasters' groups. Approximately half of the administrators mentioned this method of dissemination.

A few of the larger districts have prepared reports which are available to interested persons. Copies of some of these are being included

with this report (See Appendix A). Some schools exchanged proposals and sent teachers to visit neighboring projects. Several of the schools allowed their coordinator to assist other districts with their Title 1 projects.

Newspaper articles were the most frequently used means of formal dissemination. Other means mentioned were presentations at meetings such as the PTA and school boards, reports to patrons, evaluation reports distributed to local non-public schools, and project children participating in local and county activities.

2. The required state evaluation report was the primary method of disseminating information to the State Department of Public Instruction. Local administrators also spoke informally with the Title 1 coordinator concerning the progress of their respective programs. The few schools which prepared written reports other than those required made them available to the State Department.

(b) The State has disseminated abstracts of all Title 1 projects. Because projects have been in operation for a short time, promising educational practices are only beginning to emerge. As these practices are proven to be effective, information will immediately be made available to all schools within the state as well as those interested from throughout the nation. Newsletters and various memoranda were mailed periodically to all schools. Copies of these are contained in Appendix B.

Summary of primary dissemination efforts by Local Educational Agencies to other LEA's:

1. Informal discussions
2. Formal reports
3. Speeches to interested groups

4. Exchange of personnel
5. Distribution of proposals
6. Newspaper articles

to the State Department of Public Instruction:

1. Evaluation report
2. Informal consultation
3. Project summaries

3. Evaluation:

(a) Evaluation efforts were begun late in the year after receipt of the guidelines from the United States Office of Education. The guidelines prepared by the State for the previous year were not extensive. They are contained in Appendix C. The Title 1 coordinator and evaluation officers provided consultant services for all districts requesting such. Guidelines for the 1966-67 projects have been prepared and are being distributed.

(b) Name and Titles of all State personnel providing evaluation assistance:

Warren Pederson, Coordinator, Title 1
James J. Kiefert, Evaluation Officer, Title 1
Thomas P. Johnson, Evaluation Officer, Title 1
William Urban, Director of Federal Fiscal Accounting
Glen R. Dolan, State Director, Guidance Services

(c) Person providing evaluation assistance to the State:

Howard Spierer, U. S. O. E., Division of Compensatory Education, Washington, D. C.

(d) Little information was given the local school districts explaining the meaning of the various types of project designs. Therefore, because of the lack of research sophistication, the validity of the replies on this item is questionable. The few districts which employ counselors or those with personnel experience in research are not easily identifiable. Thus, all replies have been tabulated from the 216 districts reporting. Use of this data should be made with the above in mind.

Number of Projects	Evaluation Design
12	Two group experimental design using the project group and a conveniently available non-project group as the control.
147	One group design using a pretest and posttest on the project group to compare observed gains or losses with expected gains.
75	One group design using pretest and/or posttest scores on the project group to compare observed performance with local, State, or national groups.
57	One group design using test data on the project group to compare observed performance with expected performance based upon data for past years in the project school.
111	One group design using test data on the project group, but no comparison data.
144	None reported.

4. Major Problem Areas:

(a) 1. Reviewing proposals: Difficulty was experienced in distinguishing and explaining categorical aid as opposed to general aid. Explaining the goals of Title 1 in terms of the "educationally deprived" and the "economically deprived" was also an arduous task. Many administrators seemed to prefer funds for the general improvement of their schools. Some such proposals had to be revised. A number of superintendents misinterpreted the guidelines accompanying the application forms and asked for things not approvable; such as requesting just buildings or equipment and materials.

2. Operation and Service: The shortage of personnel assigned to work with Title 1 was the basis for most difficulties in this category. Little time was left for much except the reviewing of proposals and the consulting necessary to revise proposals for final acceptance. The shortage hampered site visitations and dissemination of information. Reaching the administrators through workshops and conferences on the

regional and state level proved effective. In most cases the rural schools did not have the personnel necessary to properly develop an effective program; a great amount of time was devoted to helping these districts.

3. Evaluation: The difficulty of finding qualified personnel for evaluation delayed the beginning of the evaluation program. Once the personnel with the necessary skills and background were acquired, the evaluation progressed rapidly. The delay resulted in a late attempt to acquaint the schools with the evaluation process. Many schools made little attempt to establish a testing program while others ordered tests but did not receive them until after the projects had commenced. Teacher-made tests were used to a great extent which does not allow for a great deal of objective comparison between schools.

Guidelines have been developed for the 1966-67 school year. These should inform the project directors of the type of information that should be gathered during the life of the project. A persistent effort enabled this evaluation report to be based upon more than a 91% return of evaluation forms. The greatest task remaining is to convince the administrators of the value and need for adequate evaluation programs within their schools.

(b) Congress solved the number one problem encountered in administering Title 1 when it passed the amendment allowing the reallocation of unused funds. If this is not carried out, it will be a near-death blow for Title 1 in North Dakota.

The timing for funding has made Title 1 almost impossible to administer. The appropriations should be made a year in advance so an adequate job can be done in all areas of Title 1 administration.

Problem areas relating to

Proposal reviewal:

1. Distinguishing between categorical and general aid.
2. Explaining the terms educationally deprived and economically deprived.
3. Misinterpretation of guidelines.

Operation and Service:

1. Shortage of personnel.
2. Great amount of help needed by small districts.

Evaluation:

1. Finding qualified personnel.
2. Inadequate local testing programs.
3. Late arrival of evaluation reporting forms.

Recommendations for revision of legislation:

1. Allow reallocation of unused funds.
2. Allocate funds a year in advance.

5. Implementation of Section 205 (a) (1):

(a) The types of projects which were not approvable when initially submitted were as follows: projects requesting equipment only, those wanting only buildings or the remodeling of present facilities, and projects submitted by non-public schools which were not cooperating under a public school.

(b) The most common misconception of Title 1 on the part of local educational agencies concerned the scope of the Title. Some thought it was more limited than it actually was; although a few felt that it would benefit more students. More red tape was experienced than some thought would accompany this program. The administrators also felt that: the projects would not be accepted by the people, the school would receive more funds, more materials and equipment could be purchased, the programs

would not be separated from the regular program to such an extent, and they would receive better cooperation from the parents. Less than 20 per cent responded to this item with a misconception. Most had no misconceptions concerning Title 1.

Summary of non-approvable projects:

1. Requesting only buildings or remodeling
2. Wanting just equipment and materials
3. Submitted by non-public schools

Common misconception of Title 1:

1. More limited than actually was
2. Reach more children
3. More red tape than expected
4. Projects would not be accepted
5. More materials and equipment could be purchased
6. Program would not be separated to such an extent
7. Better cooperation from parents would be present

6. Coordination of Title 1 and Community Action Programs:

(a) Twenty-three Title 1 projects were located in areas which contained an approved Community Action Program.

(b) The total amount of money approved for LEA's where there was an approved Community Action Program was $441,033.55.

(c) There was little time during the initial year of Title 1 to insure coordination and cooperation other than its mention in the guidelines and memoranda distributed by the State Department (See Appendix C). Since there are not a significant amount of Community Action Programs in the state, this aspect was devoted less time in favor of other more pressing needs. More is being done the current year, especially to provide information on the possibilities for cooperation between the two agencies.

(d) The chief project of cooperation between the two groups was the Headstart Program. School facilities were generally used and the program was most often administered by the public school administrator. Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects were also present. The successes were mainly in initiating and carrying out the above mentioned programs. The school district was usually the "doer" of the project requested by the Community Action Agency.

(e) The major problem encountered in the relationship between Community Action groups and Local Educational Agencies was the lack of leadership on the part of the Community Action Agency. Frequently it was noted that the CAA would organize just long enough to establish a project. They also displayed a lack of knowledge concerning sound educational practice and administrative techniques. Poor communication was blamed for much of the lack of coordination. Problems arose when Community Action groups insisted upon complete authority in administering educational programs, while the Local Educational Agency felt that it was better qualified to handle such programs. Thus, some friction was present in a minority of the projects. These instances were rare and good cooperation was the rule rather than the exception.

Problems encountered:

1. Lack of leadership and educational sophistication by CAA
2. Poor communication

(f) The Community Action programs were generally inter-related with the Local Educational Agencies by the acquisition of funds by the former and the administration of the program by the latter. The CAA usually organized

to apply for funding. Then the program was turned over to the Local Educational Agency which, in turn, carried out the program. The school usually provided the space and hired or furnished the personnel. In two instances the CAA insisted upon retaining full authority throughout the term of the program.

In one program a counselor hired with Title 1 funds also worked with Headstart pupils. Another situation found transportation furnished by one and food services by the other agency. Materials and equipment purchased in conjunction with basic skill or library projects of Title 1 were utilized in the Headstart programs. Of course, Youth Corps projects involved many of the same pupils that were aided in Title 1 programs, so some inter-relation resulted.

(g) One of the most frequently mentioned recommendations for legislative revision by the Local Educational Agencies was to place Community Action Programs directly under the Local Educational Agency. This would insure the programs of the direction of people who make education their business. It would also eliminate duplication of effort and the overlapping of services.

The second wish was for more information on the ways in which the two agencies can cooperate. Information was also desired on the project possibilities under the Community Action Agency.

Other recommendations expressed the need for simplifying Community Action Program forms, reducing red tape, and placing the program in the hands of the school after the Community Action Agency has been funded.

7. Inter-Relationship of Title I With Other Titles of ESEA:

(a) Title I funds were most often used in conjunction with funds from Title II. Books and materials purchased under Title II were utilized by disadvantaged children in Title I programs. For example, remedial reading classes read books purchased with Title II funds. Many of the Title II books were selected with disadvantaged children in mind by the library personnel hired under Title I. The practice of hiring librarians and clerks with Title I funds to organize and catalogue books and materials purchased under Title II was common. The library was also open longer so more use could be made of Title II books.

Title I money was used to supplement Title II funds in the purchasing of books and materials for the disadvantaged. Materials purchased under Title II were used on equipment acquired with Title I appropriations.

Inter-relationship of funds:

1. Title II materials used by deprived children
2. Title II materials catalogued and organized by Title I personnel
3. Title II materials made available for longer periods of time
4. Title II funds supplemented by Title I funds
5. Materials and equipment correlated

(b) No Title III projects were in operation in North Dakota during the 1965-66 year with the exception of planning grants. However, during some of the planning grant surveys new needs were discovered which were previously unknown. Some of these needs were later met with projects funded under Title I.

(c) No Title IV funds were used in Title I schools during the 1965-66 program year.

(d) The schools received additional consultant help from the strengthened State Department of Public Instruction. Title I teachers received help in the regional workshops conducted by State Department personnel. Administrators received information on Title I, II, and III in workshops and conferences sponsored by the State Department.

(e) Great success was achieved in implementing projects relating Title I to Title II as stated in (a) above. Title II materials were ordered with the disadvantaged children in mind, were housed in Title I equipment, were made accessible because of Title I library projects, and were organized by Title I personnel.

Title I projects made great use of Title II materials. There was a greater use of audio-visual materials purchased under both Titles. Students in Title I groups were said to have been better stimulated to learn because of the use of Title II materials.

(f) Time, once again, was the source of many problems in relating Title I with other Titles of ESEA. There was little time available to devote to the coordination of Titles. Most of the effort was expended in writing individual programs without concern for coordination.

Some schools did not apply for funds other than Title I because of the small size of their allocations. In others the funds arrived too late to allow coordination.

The time and personnel required to secure funds under other Titles was prohibitive to the small districts of North Dakota. The duplication of Titles made record keeping difficult where projects were coordinated.

(g) Most of the recommendations for legislative changes were aimed at the combination of Titles so money could be sought in one application. This would also cut down on the paper work to which others objected. Some revision of legislation was also requested to enable small districts to acquire funding under Titles III and IV. Perhaps some assisting personnel could be made available to the small districts, or the allocation of these funds could be turned over to the State Departments. Others suggested a single agency to handle all allocations.

Earlier allocation of funds would provide more time for coordination. More money for Titles I and II was also requested.

Of course, many wanted all funds combined and given to the schools as general aid with no requirements attached. Others desired longer t erm financing to insure better planning and continuity of programs.

A different method for allocating funds was also requested. The poorer district received more Title I money but less Title II funds. In reality these districts need more of both kinds of funds.

Recommendations for legislative revision:

1. Combine Titles
2. Allow one application to include Titles I, II, III, and IV
3. Enable small districts to acquire Titles III and IV funds
4. Single agency administering all funds
5. Earlier allocation of funds
6. Larger allocations
7. Remove restrictions in using funds
8. Initiate a different method for allocating monies

8. <u>Cooperative Projects Eetween Districts:</u>

(a) Thirteen Local Educational Agencies were involved in cooperative projects between districts. Most of these projects employed specialized personnel to visit cooperating schools. A number of projects employed

speech therapists to help handicapped children in the districts. Music and physical education personnel were also hired in this way. One project established a county-wide special education class. Two cooperative projects utilized mobile classrooms together with visiting teachers to aid the one room schools in rural districts.

(b) With the many rural districts in North Dakota, cooperative projects provide an excellent opportunity for making available to the culturally disadvantaged students educational opportunities never before possible. These projects are not being organized for a number of reasons. First, the necessary leadership is often not present. The rural teacher doesn't have the time and often the specialization necessary to plan a project and solicit cooperation from other districts. Perhaps an inservice program for county superintendents to prepare them to assume the leadership role is a solution.

Secondly, there is more distrust of Federal aid in rural areas. An information program for rural school boards would be a big help. The rural districts of the State are the areas without Title I projects. Most city districts have one or more projects.

Other problems cited by administrators were the distance between schools, conflict with various activities in the respective communities, the paper work involved, and, generally, a lack of time to solicit cooperation.

Summary of problems concerning cooperative projects:

1. Insufficient leadership in rural areas
2. Scarcity of time to develop cooperative projects
3. Distrust of Federal aid to education
4. Distance between schools
5. Conflict with community activities
6. Paper work involved

(c) One suggestion for legislative revision was the request for the provision of regional coordinators to promote cooperative projects. This would be a great aid for small school districts in North Dakota. Others requested bonus funds to encourage cooperative projects.

In order to reduce paper work, one school could have the responsibility for the administration and organization of the project and the other would contribute on a per pupil basis. This was proposed to allow one district to assume the leadership and assure that the project is carried through. If no one is assigned the primary responsibility, very often the project lacks direction or does not get started at all.

Suggestions for legislative action:

1. Coordinators in rural areas
2. Additional funds for cooperative projects
3. Assign administrative responsibility to one school

9. Non-public School Participation:

(a) The guidelines for project proposals stressed the importance of cooperation with non-public schools. The mandate was carried out quite well by those few districts within which there are non-public schools.

(b) Most projects involving non-public school children were held on public school grounds, either during the regular school day or during the summer. Joint committees were often established to plan projects in order to meet the needs of disadvantaged students in both schools.

Other programs provided specialists on a visiting basis to non-public schools. Cooperation was generally excellent such as during a summer guidance project for both public and non-public school students. Great success was noted, and this project was selected for national recognition.

(c) The most common problem mentioned concerning public and non-public school cooperation was the difference in needs of the two schools. Also, most of the paper work had to be done by the public school officials. Parents of some of the non-public school children would not allow their children to attend the classes in the public school. However, the majority did attend.

There was some misunderstanding about the intent of the law concerning what types of programs were permitted in non-public schools and how the funds and materials were to be administered. A few non-public school officials believed that any type of project could be held on non-public school grounds and that they would have the same opportunities as the public schools.

Scheduling and transportation proved difficult in two projects, but these were overcome. In a few instances, the non-public schools lacked space and equipment to facilitate the project, but this was a problem common to both schools.

Problems listed involving public and non-public school cooperation:

1. Diverse needs
2. Burden on the public schools
3. Lack of parental approval
4. Misunderstanding of the intent of the law
5. Scheduling
6. Transportation
7. Lack of space and equipment

(d) Funding of both public schools and non-public schools under separate proposals was the most often suggested form of legislative revision. This was suggested to lessen the bookkeeping, most of which had to be done by the public school administrators, and facilitate the meeting of diverse needs found in the two types of schools. Allied to this, some wished that equipment could be provided to the non-public schools on a permanent basis. Other than the above, only minor administrative problems arose and these were easily ironed out.

Summary of suggestions:

1. Funding of both public and non-public schools
2. Provision of equipment to non-public schools on a permanent basis

(e) Number of projects and non-public school children participating by type of arrangement.

Schedule	On Public School Grounds Only		On Non-Public School Grounds Only		On both Public & Non-Public School Grounds		On Other than Public or Non-Public School Grounds	
	Proj.	*Children	Proj.	*Children	Proj.	*Children	Proj.	*Children
Regular School Day	17	365	7	118	13	1134	5	253
Before School Day	1	32						
After School	1	3						
Weekend								
Summer	24	556			3	76	2	107
Reg. Sch. Day & Before School								
Reg. Sch. Day & After School								
Reg. Sch. Day & Weekend								
Reg. Sch. Day & Summer								
Before & After School								
After School & Weekend								
After Sch., Weekend & Summer								
After School & Summer								
Reg. Sch. Day, Before School & After School								
Reg. Sch. Day, Before School, Weekend, & Summer								
Other (Specify)								
TOTAL	43	956	7	118	16	1210	7	363

*This figure is not an unduplicated count of children.

10. General Analysis of Title I.

The children's self concept and enthusiasm for school were considered positive over-all objectives for Title I projects in the State. In an attempt to measure these variables, each project coordinator was asked to supply data concerning these objectives. This information is summarized in the tables below.

Children's Self Concept

Observed Frequencies

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Superior
Pre-test	3056	4335	3596	1139	374
Post-test	1559	3709	4938	1874	618

Children's Enthusiasm For School

Observed Frequencies

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	Superior
Pre-test	2796	3995	3958	1756	409
Post-test	1296	3205	4816	3129	833

When this data is subjected to a Chi Square analysis using observed frequencies in cells, the differences between the pre-test and post-test scores for both variables prove significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. It can therefore be stated with confidence that the Title I projects have had a significant effect upon the children's self concept and enthusiasm for school.

The largest change reported by the project coordinators was the change in attitude displayed by the children who participated in the Title I projects. The most frequently mentioned changes were toward

increased cooperation and improved attitude toward school in general, teachers, and classroom work. The students felt as though the teachers really cared about them personally because of the individualized instruction and attention made possible by the Title I projects. The children were generally able to work at their own level and not under pressure to keep up with a large class.

It can also be stated generally that the younger the children, the more progress made. This may be partially explained by the short duration of most Title I projects and the general attitude of older students toward being singled out for a special project and the awareness of peer group pressures. It appears to take a longer period of time to develop the cooperation and enthusiasm in older children when compared with younger children.

Achievement scores indicated a general improvement during the Title I project periods. Because of the lack of control group data, it is difficult to generalize as to the effectiveness of the projects in raising the achievement scores which were reported. Maturation plus the Hawthorne Effect may account for all or some of this noted achievement gain. Only through the use of control groups and the control of extraneous variables may definite results be identified. It can definitely be stated that achievement scores did improve considerably during the Title I project periods. The exact cause of this improvement remains to be definitely identified. Projects which are presently being carried out over a year-long period will provide the control necessary for a cause and effect relationship.

In the rural areas of North Dakota many of the children are culturally

as well as economically disadvantaged. School districts in these areas are not financially able to offer even adequate educational opportunities. As Title I funds are utilized by more and more of these districts, the children will have some of the educational opportunities and services which their counterparts in non-disadvantaged areas enjoy. As Title I projects illustrate to the citizens of North Dakota what can and has to be done for education in this State, they are becoming and will become more willing in the future to make a greater local effort to provide quality education for all students.

In summary, Title I has been extremely successful in enhancing educational opportunities, enriching experiences, raising the achievement level, and significantly improving the general attitude toward education of children involved in Title I projects.

Part II

1. Comprehensive Analysis

1. STATISTICAL INFORMATION

Classification	Number of LEA's for which Title I programs have been approved	Funds Actually Committed	Unduplicated Count of Children: Total Col. 5, 6 & 7	Public	Non-Public	Not Enrolled	Average cost per pupil Col. 3 by Col. 4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
A							
B	1	63,850.00	668	580	88		93.33
C							
D	14	394,280.52	8,915	7,614	1401		44.23
E	225	2,647,506.50	29,152	27,704	1448		90.82
TOTAL							

2. Establishing Project Areas:

A few of the larger school districts designated target schools which enrolled predominently disadvantaged children. Current welfare records were used to select the schools to be included in Title I projects. The "Aid to Dependent Children" figures were the ones used for this purpose. The remainder of the schools were single school districts or districts in which the disadvantaged children were equally present in all schools.

3. Needs:

In general, the deprived children in North Dakota were found to be weak in all areas of basic skills. Lack of reading and language skills were identified as the basis for much of the weakness, but a great need was seen to improve all basic skills.

The pupils in this State were not receiving the physical education needed to develop healthy bodies and personal health habits. Many small schools cannot afford to hire qualified personnel in this area. Many children have not had the opportunity to participate in organized recreation programs and learn new sports.

Libraries were also identified as an area needing improvement. Title II funds provided some of the materials, but most libraries remained unorganized and were used to a minimum. To supplement the building of language skills and other basic skills, libraries needed improvement.

Many deprived children entering first grade did not possess the readiness for school needed for optional development. With this disadvantage the children soon fell behind their classmates and became discouraged. It is hoped that by means of the pre-school program, much remedial work later on will be eliminated.

Few schools have guidance programs in North Dakota, and many of the existing ones are inadequate for the number of students counseled. Since many children from this State will be moving to other areas to attend school or work, a guidance program is necessary. These students also need the adjustment counseling that students in other states receive.

Nothing is being done in many rural areas to help those with speech handicaps. Small schools cannot afford a qualified person to serve the few disadvantaged children. By means of cooperative projects, speech therapists are helping rural students.

In rank order the most pressing needs of students in North Dakota are:

1. Inadequate command of all basic skills
2. Lack of readiness for entry into first grade
3. Unorganized libraries not accessible to students
4. Inadequate acquaintance with formal education
5. Poor reading ability
6. Meager contact with music
7. Little help with planning and adjustment problems
8. Speech defects

4. Local Educational Agency Problems:

Lack of qualified personnel was definitely the most wide-spread problem encountered by local officials in implementing Title I projects. Approximately 30 per cent responding to this item listed personnel as a problem. Reading specialists were in demand, followed by music and library instructors. Speech therapists and pre-school teachers were also difficult to hire. Other personnel shortages mentioned were Physical Education, Industrial Arts, basic skills, Science, English, Math, and Special Education instructors; guidance counselors, and personnel for planning and administering the program. Most schools were able to hire people to fill the positions but were unable to get the quality they desired.

Due to the demand upon suppliers; tests, equipment, and materials were difficult to acquire. The items that were received often arrived late in the program or after its conclusion. Ten percent of the LEA's listed this as a problem.

Nine per cent of the schools did not have adequate building space to house projects. The timing of the appropriations contributed to the personnel and space problems. Because money arrived late in the year, qualified teachers were already under contract. Arrangement for additional space was also difficult on short notice. Classes were held in hallways, coat rooms, on stages, and in store rooms. The time allowed was also inadequate to prepare and carry out an effective project. Year-long projects are more desirable.

Acceptance of Title I either by students, parents, or teachers was a problem for a few schools. Some students wouldn't accept the identification as disadvantaged; the parents did not want their children to be so identified and separated; and a few teachers rejected the idea that only a few should receive the benefits.

The next most frequent problem areas were lack of secretarial help, extra burden on the administrators to plan and organize projects while providing inadequate funds for administration, attendance at summer projects, identifying the needs of the deprived, and developing projects to meet the identified needs. The attendance problem arose because of conflicts with summer Bible schools, 4-H Camps, jobs, and recreational activities. Coordination of Title I programs with the remainder of the school's program proved difficult in six instances.

The problems mentioned less than four times were lack of school

board support, lack of knowledge of budgetary needs, no provisions for non-certified personnel, little time to administer tests or perform other types of evaluation, travel inconvenience between schools, insufficient funds for a sound program, and identifying the low income students.

In order of frequency, the problem areas for the Local Educational Agencies in North Dakota were:

1. Personnel
2. Space
3. Slow arrival of supplies and equipment
4. Lack of time for planning and completing projects
5. Late allocation of funds
6. Acceptance by students, parents, and teachers
7. Lack of secretarial help
8. Too great of a demand on administrators' time
9. Attendance
10. Scheduling and coordination with regular program
11. Inadequate funds for administration
12. Lack of time for evaluation
13. Selection of best projects to meet local needs
14. Insufficient funds
15. Lack of board support
16. Travel inconvenience
17. No provision for non-certified personnel
18. Little knowledge of budgetary needs
19. Identifying the low income students

5. Prevalent Activities:

	Number of Projects
1. Basic Skills	210
2. Pre-school	55
3. Library	45
4. Physical Education	37
5. Music	18
6. Remedial Reading	17
7. Guidance and Counseling	12
8. Special Education	10
9. Speech	9
10. Science	8
11. Reduce Teacher-Pupil Ratio	6
12. Audio-Visual	5
13. Language	3
14. Business Education	3
15. Driver Education	2
16. Industrial Arts and Manual Skills	3
17. Social Studies	1
18. Mathematics	1
19. Improve Student-School-Home Relationship	1
20. In-Service Training	1
21. Camping	1

6. Innovative Projects:

Again, because of the shortage of time and the late beginning of evaluation, the evaluators were unable to visit many projects as most of them were completed. This section is based upon comments from the project directors made on the evaluation reporting forms.

The largest percentage of project directors felt that their project was nothing out of the ordinary and that expected results were achieved. The projects described below do have dissemination possibilities, at least in this State as well as in other rural states. The State project number is given first, followed by the location of the district and a brief description of the project.

51-1, New Public School District #8, Williston:

Two mobile units were purchased and equipped with collaborating teachers and the necessary materials and equipment for improvement of basic skills. The units were moved periodically from school to school. The teachers helped the resident teacher in these rural schools by working individually with deprived children. This proved to be a tremendous aid for teachers responsible for students in up to eight different grades.

114-1, Reeder:

One aspect, at least, of this project was interesting. Tape recorders were employed in parent-teacher conferences as well as in the classrooms. Students were recorded while reading at the beginning of the project and again periodically during the course of the instruction. Students and

parents were able to hear the improvement being made, motivating both groups and convincing them of the value of the program.

185-1, Eelfield:

This was another project utilizing a mobile basic skills unit similar to project 51-1. The operation was much the same and the results achieved were as encouraging as the other. The mobile unit enables rural areas to upgrade instruction without a great burden to any individual school.

264-4, Fargo, "Sac and Soc"

A description of this project can be found in Appendix C.

341-Goodrich

A little different approach to summer school instruction in a rural area was taken by this school. Regular buses were converted into classrooms for the summer. The teacher drove the bus to the farm where deprived children were living. There he would give individual and small group instruction in the basic skill areas. Attendance problems were solved, and the parents and children enthusiastically supported the project.

341-Goodrich:

In the same school district as the project above a different means was used to overcome the absence of swimming facilities in the area. A portable swimming pool was placed in the gymnasium of the school and lessons were given to needy children. The pool could then be used even in adverse weather.

A sample of human interest stories follows which are typical of the many received.

"There are many cases that come to mind. One involved a seventh grade girl who had withdrawn from her peer group and was having many problems in school. She was referred to the project when her achievement test indicated she needed help in reading and math. When she came over to the basic skills program and was alone with the instructor, she was very eager to learn, but upon returning to the classroom she would again become sad. The Title I instructor was finally able to find out what was wrong. Her mother and father were getting a divorce. Besides the 'normal' distress that this causes in the life of a child, she had to bear up under the stress of small community gossip which was being voiced by her classmates.

"I relate this story to illustrate a point. I have found that most educationally deprived children usually have many social problems as well."

"We have found in working with this group, in which each child has a similar disability, that behavior is not a problem. Many of these students, during the school year, seek to be noticed through misconduct as their only way of getting the desired attention. In this group, they are more able to work at their own level and rate, and have gained attention through successful achievement and accomplishments."

"One 7th grade pupil--a non-reader--when he discovered he could read by himself, understand and therefore enjoy his reading, asked many times if he could not read the whole story to the group.

"Several pupils asked for longer periods.

"Several pupils asked for the continuation of said program with a plea, 'I want to learn to read.'

"Another comment, 'These reading classes seem so short-couldn't we stay longer?'

"Pupils who watched the time carefully, if I dismissed a minute earlier, would comment, 'Couldn't we do some more? The next class isn't due for a minute or two yet."

"The true success of the program can be measured by the observation of children, who before were non-reading students, who read for the first time during the course of this project."

"At the beginning of the session, one lad came to me and said, 'This is really a horrible way to have to spend my summer vacation going to school.' I quickly agreed, saying, 'How true, I had planned to do so many things and now I must change all my plans.' He made a hasty about face----and sympathized with me by patting me on the shoulder and saying, 'Buck up, Mrs. L., it will only be for six weeks and you'll have some vacation time then.' He had no more objections to summer school as long as he had a fellow sufferer!

"Another boy, after several workouts on his reading difficulties states, 'Gee, Mrs. L., this omitting and substituting and guessing in reading is for the birds. I'm gonna stop it.' He did!"

"When the children who participated in this preschool project entered first grade there were many favorable comments from the faculty and staff members of the school. Most observers felt that these children were more independent and self-reliant than most first grade students during the first weeks of school.

"The lunch room staff was pleased with the way the children followed directions and were able to help themselves."

"One of the pupils, Darcey Bonnet, has an artificial leg. It does not fit particularly well, and it is obvious that it is not real but artificial. We wondered how, with this handicap, she would adjust to the group and they to her. Children are thoughtless and often cruel and what they might do and say could easily wreak havoc with a child's personality and leave a permanent scar.

"However, we found that after a very short time no one seemed to notice her artificial leg nor pay much attention to her disability, nor did she. She entered into all activities, even running games, skipping and jumping rope.

"We feel that because of the already established adjustment, which was made with only her peers present, entering school this fall was made much easier for her and her parents. She is the oldest child in her family."

"Quotes from students:

'This summer course has helped me a good deal, and I think that it is a worthwhile program. I liked it better than my school year course because things were explained better. We covered some of the things that I had trouble with through the year. I have learned almost as much in one month as I did in a whole semester.'

'I learned more in three weeks than a semester. I liked the work much better as a whole. True, the work was hard, the hours long. Maybe I should have even tried harder.'

'I thought the summer school was very good and fun. I learned a lot from it, and I liked going to the board best because it was fun and easier to do the problems that way. I thought the hours were long; but otherwise, it was very good.'"

"I am positive that two high school drop-outs were averted because of the additional interest shown students needing extra help and encouragement.

"I feel that the number of possible failures in English in the Senior High School (9-12) was reduced by about eight (8). This was due to increased interest and effort on the part of these students."

"The art instructor indicated that the children that he taught in creative art were highly motivated in this area. It appears that the several Indian children have a particular latent ability to excel in art. The instructor was greatly pleased in their work and felt that in this area more of the Indian children could excel. It was because of this revealed excellence that students were highly motivated in his class. It would appear that the Title I program

has made a definite inroad in developing an incentive for the Indian children to find their place in life."

"Parent and pupil comments on the Basic Skills Program are as follows:

"Mother: The Basic Skills Summer Program has been a big help for my child. He had a reading problem and it certainly has improved.

"Child: I thought it was fun. I like to read now. (This was from a child who was a second grader functioning at pre-primer level.

"Mother: I feel the program has helped Bernard with some of his reading problems. He has really looked foreward to each new class. I'm hoping good results show in the coming school session.

"Child: I enjoyed the Basic Skills Program. I liked the vocabulary tests, the SRA and the other reading. There wasn't anything I didn't like. I think it helped me with my reading difficulty. (Which was comprehension)

"Child from same family at the Fifth grade level: I enjoyed the Basic Skills Program this summer. What I liked was the SRA and then telling what we read. I think it helped with my reading. It helped me tell what the story was about.

"Mother: I find Joan asks herself what she has read after finishing a story--not just hurrying to finish the reading. I do feel it has helped her.

"Mother: I believe the Basic Skills Summer Program was valuable. Reading is too often neglected the three summer months and this program definitely served to keep them aware of the world of books. I have no bad comments. Anything that can stimulate the minds of our children, besides the ever present inferior programs on television is to be commended.

"Child: I liked it and it helped my reading.

"Mother: The children enjoyed the reading classes and it was an asset to improving their reading ability.

"Child: It helped me to read better.

"Mother: I think this is one of the best programs there is. It is just wonderful for a child to get extra help when they need it. I am all for it and willing to help in any way.

"Child: Yes, I liked the Phonics Program because I had never had it before and it is fun. I did not like the SRA."

"It was interesting to note that these students were, in our estimation, more interested in school because of the small classes which gave them much more individual attention. It was noted that one boy responded in class for the first time during our summer session. In another instance one boy's attendance at summer school was better than during the regular school year, even though his summer attendance was voluntary.

"We have one boy who dropped out of school two months before the end of the term of 1965-66. Junior year----attended summer Title I school----We are happy to say he is back in school now planning to graduate."

"A young lad moved here from the Deep South. He was being adopted by a local family. He admittedly was having problems. His teachers in the South said he was acting out and being very disruptive. Through group and individual counseling this child responded very well. His attitude changed. He felt wanted. He became manageable and cooperative in a short period of time. This case proved interesting as here was a young lad with a dialect, change of home environment, change of parents, strange surroundings, previous emotional behavior problems confirmed and many other problems. His case looked rather hopeless; yet in four months he made a marvelous adjustment."

"In counseling with a girl of limited ability and from a home with modest resources, it was rewarding to have this student become aware of and gain a realistic insight of herself and environment. The girl had been operating in the period of occupational decision-making known as fantasy. She stated in one of the later interviews her situation in almost exactly the same terms. She said, 'I've been going around in a wish-dream world----That's O. K. for kids, but I'm now at the age where I can see what I am---and I better find out what it's worth.' This statement was the start of her search for her self identity and worth."

7. Methods of Increasing Staff for Title I Projects:

Nearly half of the schools hired people from the local community to fill vacancies created by Title I projects. In some of the districts, qualified specialists were reassigned to Title I projects and local recruits filled the vacated positions. Some of the local people employed were teachers who had been in previous years employed full time and at the time were retired or housewives; others were teaching part-time and under Title I were employed full time. A number were substitute teachers employed full time.

College and State teacher placement bureaus were also used to a great extent. Mid-year graduates were employed in this manner. Previous-year graduates had already been hired by the time Title I funds were available.

Present staff members were given additional assignments in many instances. This practice was most common when procuring staff for summer projects and projects conducted before and after school hours.

A number of schools placed advertisements in newspapers and on radio. Present staff and neighboring superintendents recommended some of the people employed for Title I instruction. County superintendents provided lists of available personnel to schools in a few instances.

The methods used to secure Title I staff in order of frequency were:

1. People available locally
2. College placement bureaus
3. Extra assignments for present staff
4. State Teachers Employment Bureau
5. Newspaper advertisements
6. Substitute and part-time teachers
7. Recommendation of present staff
8. County superintendents
9. Other superintendents
10. Radio announcements

8. Measuring Instruments

The most prevalently used standardized instruments are presented by grade levels in order of frequency.

(a) Pre-Kindergarden/Kindergarden

Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form A
Ginn Pre-Reading Test
SRA Primary Mental Ability
Gates Reading Survey
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test
Kulman-Anderson Test
Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness
Templin Darley Test of Articulation

(b) Grades 1-3

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
SRA Achievement Batteries (PMA)
Gates Primary Reading Test
Gates Reading Profile
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test
California Achievement Test

Metropolitan Readiness Test
Metropolitan Achievement
Diagnostic Reading Tests
Kulman-Anderson Test
Slossen Oral Reading Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary
Durrell Analysis
Gilmore-Jastak
Templin Darley Test of Articulation
John Schaum Music Appreciation Test
Selmer Music Guidance Survey

(c) Grades 4-6

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
SRA Achievement
Gates Primary Reading Test
Gates Reading Profile
Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty
Doren Diagnostic Reading Test
California Achievement Test
Metropolitan Achievement Test
Nelson Reading Test
Slassen Oral Reading Test
AAHPER Youth Fitness Test
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test
John Schaum Music Appreciation Test
Selmer Music Guidance Survey

(d) Grades 7-9

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
Iowa Test of Educational Development
SRA Achievement
SRA Reading Diagnostic
Doren Diagnostic Reading Test
AAHPER Youth Fitness Test
Purdue English Test
John Schaum Music Appreciation Test
Watkins-Farnum Performance Scale

(e) Grades 10-12

Iowa Test of Educational Development
SRA Achievement
Daily Vocational
Mooney Problem Check List
Commercial Education Survey

9. Analysis of Effective Activities and Methods

The five types of projects which have been judged most effective are presented below for each school level specified.

1. Early years-(Pre-School through Grade 3)

Development of appropriate habits and skills in pre-school
Basic Skills--Reading Readiness
Physical Fitness
Library-Introduction and Utilization
Music-Appreciation and Development

2. Middle years - (Grade 4 through Grade 6)

Basic Skills - Reading
Basic Skills - Arithmetic
Physical Fitness
Music - Appreciation and Development
Library - Introduction and Utilization

3. Teen years - (Grades 7 through Grade 12)

Basic Skills - Reading
Physical Fitness
Guidance and Counseling
Library - Introduction and Utilization
Music - Appreciation and Development

In the area of basic skills, the younger students were considerably more enthusiastic and receptive. During the later teen years a basic skills program required the admittance of a weakness in the individual. Complicated by peer group pressures, the basic skills programs required considerably more public relations and proof of its worth by the older students before the program was accepted.

The physical fitness programs were unanimously accepted by the students at all grade levels. Summer school projects dominated this category. This type of project readily lends itself to evaluation, utilization of personnel, materials, and equipment. The only weakness noted was a lack of natural facilities, in most areas, for swimming

instruction. This handicap was overcome by the innovative project cited previously.

In general, the critical procedural aspect which was most characteristic of the projects was the individualized instruction and attention provided because of the Title I project. The students appeared to respond readily and enthusiastically because of the increased attention and accrued feeling of self-worth derived from this experience. Whether this change in attitude and behavior is long lasting can only be measured in the years to come. If these programs continue to receive support, any placebo or Hawthorne effect will be measureable. Only then can any true benefits from the Title I projects be properly evaluated.

10. Supplementary Material

(a) Does not apply

(b) Does not apply

(c) The following is a compilation of objective measurements of educational attainment matched upon test form, objectives, and approximate testing date. All data which could be matched was pooled and a random sample selected for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the SRA Achievement. Due to the diversity of test forms, objectives, methods of reporting results, and testing dates, tables for other tests used would not be meaningful.

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
(Sample of 10)

Pre-Test Mean Raw Scores	Post-Test Mean Raw Scores	Mean Gain (+) or Loss (-)
27.5	40.3	+12.5
29.0	31.4	+ 2.4
22.1	30.3	+ 8.2
30.0	33.4	+ 3.4
26.8	30.1	+ 3.3
28.6	33.5	+ 4.9
28.3	31.6	+ 3.3
30.0	30.8	+ .8
28.6	36.1	+ 7.5
29.6	31.4	+ 1.8

Total 48.1 ÷ 10= +4.81

SRA Achievement
(Sample of 10)

Pre-Test Mean Raw Scores	Post-Test Mean Raw Scores	Mean Gain (+) or Loss (-)
53.1	68.3	+15.2
48.6	52.9	+ 4.3
47.6	47.7	+ .1
54.6	54.6	+ .0
55.4	55.6	+ .2
50.0	63.0	+13.0
57.8	68.3	+10.5
51.6	51.9	+ .3
49.6	51.4	+ 1.8
54.4	54.8	+ .4

45.8 ÷ 10= 4.58

Gates Basic Reading Test
(Sample of 6)

Pre-Test Mean Raw Scores	Post-Test Mean Raw Scores	Mean Gain (+) or Loss (-)
18.5	19.8	+ 1.3
21.0	23.0	+ 2.0
27.4	29.5	+ 2.1
26.0	28.1	+ 2.1
19.1	20.0	+ 1.0
21.4	25.5	+ 4.1
		12.6 ÷ 6 = +2.1

Part III Tabular Data

Table I - For a selected sample of representative projects in skill development subjects and attitudinal and behavioral development, the number of projects that employed each of the specified types of standardized tests and other measures has been indicated.

Table 1

	Projects in: Skill Development Subjects					Projects in: Attitudinal & Behavioral Development				
	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	Pre-K/ Kind.	Grades 1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
Measures										
1. Standardized Tests & Inventories	N=25	N=25	N=20	N=20	N=10	N=5	N=5	N=5	N=5	N=5
a. Achievement	21	23	19	18	10	4	2	5	5	4
b. Intelligence		23	19	17	10		2	3	5	4
c. Aptitude	8	11	4	3		4	3	4	1	1
d. Interest			2	4	1				2	
e. Attitude										
f. Others Diagnostic (Specify)									1	
	17	12	9	9			Mooney Problem Check List			
2. Other Tests										
a. Locally Devised Tests	19	23		12	7		1	2	1	2
b. Teacher Made Tests	21	25	20	18	8	3	4	3	2	1
c. Others (Specify)										
3. Other Measures										
a. Teacher Ratings	5	2		6	6	5	5	1	3	4
b. Anecdotal Records	13	19	6	13	8		1		3	
c. Observer Reports	3	7	4	3	1	5	3	4	4	3
d. Others (Specify)										

TABLE 2 - The following tables have been constructed summarizing the number of projects that showed substantial progress, some progress, and no progress in achieving their objectives. The tables have been constructed for the major types of projects. This is not an unduplicated count. A project that included children from different grade levels evaluated the progress in achieving their objectives for each grade level and is reported thus.

Table 2a

Basic Skills

	A. Primary Objective			B. Secondary Objective		
School Level	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Substantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Preschool	7	2		5	3	
Grades 1-3	84	79		65	74	
Grades 4-6	74	85	2	59	79	1
Grades 7-9	54	75	6	34	72	5
Grades 10-12	12	29	6	12	26	6
Total						

Table 2b

Pre-School

School Level	A. Primary Objective: Sub-stantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	B. Secondary Objective: Sub-stantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Preschool	41	3		38	3	
Grades 1-3	1	3		1	3	
Grades 4-6	3	1		2	2	
Grades 7-9	2			1	1	
Grades 10-12						
Total						

Table 2c

Library

School Level	A. Primary Objective: Sub-stantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	B. Secondary Objective: Sub-stantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Preschool	2	1	1	1	1	1
Grades 1-3	4	2	1	4	1	1
Grades 4-6	5	5	2	7	3	1
Grades 7-9	6	4	1	6	3	1
Grades 10-12	7			4	1	1
Total						

Table 2d

Physical Education

School Level	A. Primary Objective: Substantial Progress Achieved	A. Primary Objective: Some Progress	A. Primary Objective: Little or no Progress Achieved	B. Secondary Objective: Substantial Progress Achieved	B. Secondary Objective: Some Progress	B. Secondary Objective: Little or no Progress Achieved
Preschool	1	3			3	
Grades 1-3	14	9		12	8	
Grades 4-6	16	7		13	7	
Grades 7-9	12	9		12	6	
Grades 10-12	8	6	1	5	7	
Total						

Table 2e

Improvement of Instruction

School Level	A. Primary Objective: Substantial Progress Achieved	A. Primary Objective: Some Progress	A. Primary Objective: Little or no Progress Achieved	B. Secondary Objective: Substantial Progress Achieved	B. Secondary Objective: Some Progress	B. Secondary Objective: Little or no Progress Achieved
Preschool	2	1		1		
Grades 1-3	3	8		7	4	
Grades 4-6	5	7	1	6	5	1
Grades 7-9	4	6		5	4	
Grades 10-12	4	2	1	3	1	2
Total						

Table 2f

Music

	A. Primary Objective			B. Secondary Objective		
School Level	Sub-stantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved	Sub-stantial Progress Achieved	Some Progress	Little or no Progress Achieved
Preschool	1			1		
Grades 1-3	2	1		3		
Grades 4-6	10			8	1	1
Grades 7-9	8	1		7	1	1
Grades 10-12	7			5		
Total						

TABLE 3 - Attendance data is not readily available for years prior to 1965-66. The data for the current year was almost inaccessible also. A Title I school in each county was matched with a non-Title I school according to enrollment. Four counties in which all schools were involved and one in which no schools were involved were omitted. The average daily membership and average daily attendance were totaled according to elementary and secondary levels for each group.

Ninety-six schools in forty-eight counties were sampled. The percentage of attendance over membership is the only data which might have some meaning. It is believed that this will give an indication of the information desired in Table 3, although it lacks the detail requested.

Table 3

Average Daily Attendance and Average Daily Membership
in Title I and Non-Title I Schools

N = 96

	Title I Schools		Non-Title I Schools	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
ADM	8,845	7,985	7,985	3,147
ADA	8,604	4,215	7,695	3,018
$\frac{ADM}{ADA}$	.97	.92	.96	.96

TABLE 4 (Data not available)

TABLE 5 - Dropout data is not available on a state-wide basis. Very few schools recorded dropouts last year; as a result few could compute drop-out rates. On the evaluation reporting forms, schools were asked to indicate the number of dropouts by grade level for the last three years. Data for non-Title I schools is not available this year; therefore, no comparisons can be made. The new guidelines for 1966-67 explain the process of accounting for dropouts. It is hoped that the data will be available next year.

Table 5 reports the number of dropouts by grade level and year. Much of this data represents rough estimates on the part of administrators, many of whom are new in a system.

Table 5

Number of Dropouts for Title I Project Schools

	If Possible 1963-1964		If Possible 1964-1965		If Possible 1965-1966	
Grade	Title I School	Non Title I School	Title I School	Non Title I School	Title I School	Non Title I School
12	202	Not Available	222	Not Available	219	Not Available
11	244	"	272	"	261	"
10	213	"	263	"	236	"
9	110	"	126	"	115	"
8	42	"	45	"	36	"
7	Not Available	"	Not Available	"	Not Available	"
(Lower grade levels, if appropriate)						
No. of Schools	152	"	156	"	167	"
Total No. of Students	Not Available	"	Not Available	"	Not Available	"
No. of Dropouts	811	"	929	"	1167	"

TABLE 6 - Table 6 contains a sample of high schools in which there were Title I projects operating. The sample is composed of schools who furnished complete data concerning post-high school educational plans. The comparison group is a sample of high schools which did not have projects involving high school students. These schools did have a Title I project on the elementary level. State-wide data is not available relating to the plans of graduating seniors. For this reason, the above mentioned comparison group has been used.

The percentage of schools falling in each classification of continuing graduates is given in parentheses after the actual number in that group.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOL CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM 1/

	If possible 1963-1964		If possible 1964-1965		If possible 1965-1966	
	Title I Schools	* 1/	Title I Schools	* 1/	Title I Schools	* 1/
TOTAL NUMBER OF GRADUATES	1942	1679	2248	1989	2213	1994
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	58	52	60	54	59	53
MEAN SIZE OF GRADUATING CLASS	33.48	32.29	37.47	36.83	37.51	37.62
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS HAVING 0-10% CONTINUING GRADS.	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	
11 - 20%	2 (2)		1 (1)			1 (1)
21 - 30%	3 (4)	1 (1)	3 (4)		2 (2)	
31 - 40%	8 (10)		2 (2)	1 (1)	2 (2)	4 (6)
41 - 50%	8 (10)	12 (17)	9 (11)	9 (12)	9 (11)	4 (6)
51 - 60%	14 (18)	16 (23)	9 (11)	11 (15)	8 (10)	10 (14)
61 - 99%	43 (54)	40 (57)	57 (70)	50 (69)	59 (73)	52 (73)

* 1/ The norm is a sample of Non-Title I high schools.

TABLE 7

Tables for the most widely used tests in skill subjects for Title I beneficiaries for: 1964, 1965, 1966 (If beneficiaries are not possible, use Title I schools.)

(RESULTS FOR MOST WIDELY USED TESTS FOR ARITHMETIC)

TITLE I BENEFICIARIES (OR SCHOOLS)

Grade	Month & Year Tested	Test Name	Form	N Schools	N Students	Raw Score X	Raw Score S.D.	Number of Students or Schools			
								25th %ile	50th %ile	75th %ile	99th %ile
1-8	10/65	Iowa Test of Basic Skills	3	22	1533	31.09	---	583	545	394	11
1-8	10/65	SRA Achievement	C	19	913	50.41	---	412	356	140	5
1-8	3/66	Gates Reading Survey	--	7	384	23.5	---	129	199	119	1

TABULAR DATA 8

(A) The five most commonly funded Title I projects in North Dakota were:

1. Basic Skills
2. Pre-school Readiness Program
3. Library
4. Physical Education
5. Remedial Reading

(B) The most common approaches used to meet the objectives listed above were:

1. Basic Skills Improvement

   a. Reduced teacher-pupil ratio
   b. Individual attention
   c. Equipment and supplies
   d. Specialist or consultants
   e. Inservice training
   f. Team teaching

2. Pre-School Readiness

   a. Extra class
   b. Equipment and supplies
   c. Transportation

3. Library Improvement

   a. Provided a librarian
   b. Hired clerks
   c. Equipment and supplies
   d. Extended hours

4. Remedial Reading

   a. Specialists or consultants
   b. Equipment and supplies
   c. Individual attention
   d. Reduced teacher-pupil ratio

5. Physical Education and Fitness

   a. Specialists
   b. Reduced teacher-pupil ratio
   c. Equipment and supplies